

REMARKS

Status of Claims

All pending claims are canceled and replaced by new claims 23–42, each of which is supported by the application as filed. No new matter is added.

Objection to Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings as being of insufficient quality to permit examination. Replacement drawings are provided that supply figure numbers (Figs. 1A, 1B, and 2), solid lines of equal thickness, and element reference numbers.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for incorrect arrangement, lack of double spacing, lack of detail, and lack of a proper abstract.

A substitute specification is filed herewith remedying the identified deficiencies. A marked-up copy of the substitute specification is provided to show the changes made. No new matter is entered. A new abstract is also submitted.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2, 12, 14, and 16 were objected to on various grounds. The claims are canceled, so the objections are moot.

Claim Rejection: 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for improperly reciting a process. The claim is canceled, so the rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 2, and 19 (and all claims generally) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on various grounds. All previously pending claims have been canceled, so the rejections are moot.

Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 7-16 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as encompassing subject matter anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,364,392 to Strother et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as encompassing subject matter anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,653 to Rockey.

Claims 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as encompassing subject matter unpatentable over Strother et al.

All rejected claims have been canceled, so the rejections are moot.

New claim 23 specifies a device in which an inflatable/deflatable lining is fixed inside a stent. Neither Strother nor Rockey discloses this structure. Strother provides a balloon mounted on the outside of a catheter, not on the inside of a stent. Indeed, Strother does not disclose any kind of stent; rather, Strother's balloon performs both stenting and occluding. Furthermore, to put a stent around Strother's balloon would be an inappropriate and nonsensical modification of Strother, because the stent would interfere with Strother's requirement that the balloon "press against the inner walls of the blood vessel" (col. 4, line 39) and prevent the conforming seal Strother seeks by using the balloon. Rockey similarly does not disclose a stent.

For these reasons, Applicant asks the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all objections and rejections.

Dated: December 5, 2008

Customer Number: 25181

Respectfully submitted,

By /SCOTT E. KAMHOLZ/
Scott E. Kamholz, Reg. No. 48,543
FOLEY HOAG LLP
155 Seaport Blvd
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
(617) 832-1176
Attorney for Applicant